1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ooo ably well the nature of the historical process, the drama of the perpetual dissensions and crises, and the very possibility of development.

181 157 If today, in exile, we ask this or that émigré of the rank and file to describe the Russian character, we are sure to be offered two contrasting pictures. As often as not these different images correspond to the political camp of the émigré. To those of the Right and to those of the Left, Russia and the Russian show a different face.

Let us have a look at the left-wing image. This Russian is a lifelong seeker after truth, an enthusiast serving ideals with self-sacrificial ardor but frequently changing his gods and idols. He is utterly devoted to the people, to art, to ideas; eager to become a martyr for some noble cause; an irreconcilable foe of dishonesty, of compromise. An extremist in his dedication to ideas, he lives in the clouds and is estranged from reality—rootless, yet a saint in the full meaning of the word, a saint above material interests. Of the four elements, he is closest to fire and most alien to the earth—and yet he wishes to serve the earth, envisaging this service in terms of flame, conflagration, molten metal. In terms of religion, his is the eschatological type of Christianity—without a terrestrial home, but thirsting for the City of God. Or rather in search of a "New Heaven" and a "New Earth." He loathes nothing so much as moderation, regularity, the virtues of restraint and reasonableness, the smugness of a self-complacent culture. Culture, as the realm of consummate form, leaves him cold; he dreams of remolding all forms in his own crucible. The process of creation is more important to him than its product, the search for truth more important than truth itself, heroic death more important than a life full of labor. Usually he regards Belinsky as his ancestor and (today!) Dostoevsky as his supreme spokesman. It is not difficult to recognize in this image the self-portrait of the Russian intelligentsia,—not of the Russian educated class as a whole, but of that "order" whose origin goes back to the eighteen thirties.

181 ● 517 However, the intelligentsia, this latest layer of Russian culture, is not entirely lacking in national roots—or, more exactly, counterparts. For here we have to do not with the direct influence of deep popular forces but with the obscure subconscious play of the folk-soul, which in the destiny of these pseudo-renegades of nation and country repeats the features of another type, deeply embedded in the national psyche. Apostates, runaways, seekers, pilgrims—are

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

found not only on the upper level but also in the lowest stratum of the people. We meet them among the adherents of the numerous religious sects as well as among the wider circle of spiritually disturbed Russian men and women, restless seekers after religious truth. They embody the kenotic, Christ-centered brand of Russian religiosity, eternally opposed to the prevailing ritualism in liturgy and customs. These kenotic forces of folk religiosity were released by the schism of the seventeenth century, when the Church lost its former unity. The quest for a new spiritual haven began with the first doubts about the absolute orthodoxy of the Muscovite-Petersburg tsardom. Thus this national type, so vividly brought to life by the Russian literature of the nineteenth century, while comparatively of late formation, is yet much older than the intelligentsia and approximately coincides with the Empire. This does not mean that it did not spring from more ancient sources: it had a forerunner in the kenotic type of ancient Russian holiness. But its estrangement from reality, its restlessness, stamp it as a spiritual phenomenon belonging to modern history.

It is interesting to note that the Russian intelligentsia, beside its popular counterparts, has still another parallel, ever more noticeable towards the close of the nineteenth century. It is the Jewish parallel. It is not an accident that ever since the eighties, with the beginning of the exodus from the ghetto, an intimate fusion of the Russian-Jewish intelligentsia became apparent—not only in the common revolutionary struggle but in all spiritual aspirations and the essential attitude towards life: the ardent rootlessness, the eschatological prophetism. It was a spiritual atmosphere which in its intensity recalls early Christianity—deprived, however, of the central pivot of faith and therefore apt to breed aberrations of the most fanatically sectarian kind. Russian reactionaries are right in linking the intelligentsia with Judaism. But they distort the historical perspective in representing the Jews as the seducers of innocent Russian youth. The "order" of the Russian intelligentsia had long been in existence and had taken up the fight against autocracy at a time when the influx from the ghetto—attracted by spiritual affinity—had hardly begun. It is this affinity that makes the short-sighted Western observer describe the "âme slave" in Jewish terms. While many are inclined to view the Zionist endeavor in Palestine as the work of Russian intellectuals, Spengler regards the coteries of the Russian intelligentsia—which he abhors—as reflecting the spirit and tradition of the Talmudists. There certainly

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

181 517 was prevalent a specific Russian-Jewish atmosphere, of which a Jewish poet has said: "Blessed he who ever breathed that air."

000 And yet, only a foreigner may be forgiven for not distinguishing between Slavic and Semitic features in the amalgam of the intellectual-sectarian type. Surely there was nothing Jewish in Belinsky; and when Tolstoy spoke of Dostoevsky's Jewishness, he meant it, of course, in the widest metaphorical sense. The difference is subtle but plainly perceptible—rather one of style, of aesthetic pattern, than of ethical contents—which, after all, is true of most national distinctions. The kinship between the intelligentsia and popular sectarianism, on the other hand, is a primary phenomenon, sufficient in itself to establish this type of intellectual as one of the historical formations of the Russian soul.

181 157 I believe that many, and not only among the right-wingers, will refuse to acknowledge the intelligentsia as the deepest manifestation of Russianness. To myself, whenever today, in exile, I try to conjure up a pure image of the Russian, he presents himself under a different aspect. Profound calm, taciturnity, on the surface even apathy. An organic aversion for anything high-flown, high-strung, extravagant. Simplicity often carried so far as to shun a word, a gesture too much. "Silence is golden." Serene, self-confident power. The silence reflects profound Oriental experience absorbed in the blood. Hence a strain of fatalism. Hence also the humor—the tolerant smile at the foreground of life, at the ceaseless fretting and fussing of the intellect. Humor and restraint are features this type of Russian shares with the Anglo-Saxon. In the opinion of some, by the way, only the Russians and the English possess a genuine sense of humor. Tolstoy and his set—the "high society" of Anna Karenina—in all of Europe felt most at home in the Anglo-Saxon world, the only one they respected. However, this superficial similarity covers a vastly divergent experience—Western activism and Oriental fatalism; but in both worlds the violence of elemental forces was tamed by centuries-old discipline.

I shall not attempt here to define the moral aspect of this type of Russian. I believe that, as a rule, one should avoid over-precise moral characterizations of national types. The good and the wicked, the vicious and the pure are found among all of them, probably in the same proportion. What matters are the shades of goodness, of purity etc., the "how" and not the "what,"—which means definitions rather in aesthetic (in the widest sense) terms. Is the Russian kind? Quite often he is. When he is, his kindness combined with

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

has its own key to Christianity, or at least its own nuances of it. There is no need, however, to distinguish between fine shades of Christianity in the Russian soul; all the contradictions stand out with stark boldness. Just try to express in one formula the religiosity of St. Sergius and the Archpriest Avvakum, that of the Metropolitan Philaret and of Dostoevsky. For good measure, add to these Greek-Orthodox folklore and the religion of Tolstoy!

The opinion is widely held that the Russian people are set apart from other European peoples by the peculiar intensity of their religiosity. Actually this impression derives from the fact that the twentieth century finds Russia and the rest of Europe in different acts of the religious-historical drama. In Russia, among the great mass of the people, the Middle Ages lived on right down to the middle of the nineteenth century. The Europe of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries would offer a closer analogy to imperial Russia. But the collapse of Russian medievalism was stormy and destructive in the extreme. Today the attitude towards religion, both on the part of the masses and of the intelligentsia, is not markedly different from that in other European countries.

. . . And now let us turn to our basic problem: which historical layers of the Russian soul have been destroyed by the Revolution and which will survive it? The answer now should be clear. The extermination of the old educated class and the suppression of all the sources that fed it were bound to remove the two uppermost strata from the spiritual structure of Russian society. The man of Empire and the intellectual perished together with the "bourgeoisie," the upper layer of the old society. As to the imperial type, the Russian of universal culture, some relics of it still survive within the ranks of the "specialists." Some time ago, the [Soviet] government belatedly realized that the liquidation of the upper cultural stratum was doing irreparable harm to technical progress. The surviving old-timers became the object of special attention. However, they were valued only in their capacity of specialists in some narrow field; as has been wittily said, golden watches were used to drive in nails. Their broad culture, no longer needed by anyone and even offensive to the new ruling class, still subsists within some tiny groups or even families. The new educated class produces exclusively specialists who often lack the rudiments of a general culture, even plain literacy. On the other hand, never since the Muscovite tsardom has Russia been fenced off from Europe by such a high wall. This wall has been erected not only by censorship and

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

178 181 517 the ban on foreign travel, but also by inordinate conceit and outright contempt for decaying bourgeois Europe. Here lies the essential difference between the semi-literate technical intelligentsia of Tsar Peter and a similar intelligentsia under Stalin. That of Stalin has deliberately turned its back on Europe and in so doing has cut short the line of the "universal" Russian.

More complex was the fate of the intelligentsia proper. By the time the revolution broke out, this extraordinary formation had already lost its former vitality. After 1905 the intelligentsia began to dissolve, losing its identity within the whole of the "cultured" class. It was unable to survive the collapse of its political mysticism, desecrated by the pathetic Russian constitutionalism; the new brilliant religious-philosophical culture of the Russian renaissance of the twentieth century demoralized it with its many seductions; the war drew it into the stream of a national consciousness new to it. By 1917 the revolutionary enthusiasm of the intelligentsia was already a warmed-up dish. Its roots did not go deep, and the size of this social group, the only one to give loyal support to the Provisional Government, had shrunk considerably. The October Revolution hit it with all its weight. Dedicated to principles and uncompromising, the intelligentsia was utterly unable to acquiesce in the triumph of brute force. No wonder that the struggle against the new rulers bled it white. The few who survived either went into exile or filled Soviet prisons and concentration camps. Some managed to adjust themselves to the conditions of Soviet bureaucracy and turned into "specialists," gradually losing the last features of their noble "order." The mills of a brutal way of life were grinding without mercy. In the words of a Russian proverb—"to live with wolves one has to howl with them." Those unable to adjust themselves were cast out of the new life. The new intelligentsia now emerging is organically devoted to the Soviet régime; it feels a blood kinship with both the people and the ruling class. And for this reason it can never—not even in opposition, not even (let us anticipate the future) engaged in a revolutionary struggle against those in power—degenerate into that rootlessly-ideological, extremist, and eschatological type, let alone the dedicated fraternity we call the Russian intelligentsia.

However, this defunct Russian type is not entirely without successors. Sectarianism and spiritual journeying have not died out in the people, as insistently testified by the "godless" press. The Revolution has even given rise to some new sectarian formations,

1: Fedotov S-4 (no date) 1954 RF1 Great Russia RF1

usually of an eschatological nature. On the other hand, part of the old intelligentsia have found a spiritual foothold in the Church. Here the last remnants of the vanished "order" can quench their spiritual thirst from the same spring that, unknown to them, had generated it. Within the Church they have, of course, preserved their psychological characteristics: their restlessness and extremism, their thirst for an integrated, consecrated life. Here they find themselves on common ground with the searchers and pilgrims of the people. One should keep in mind that the spiritual barrier between Church and dissenters is no longer what it was before the Revolution. Persecution has brought the various creeds closer together. The remnants of the old intelligentsia act as a ferment upon the whole religious mass. So far, however, this force has either been completely eliminated from all constructive cultural work or else has voluntarily turned away from it. Insofar as Russian culture of the immediate future is concerned, the old type of intellectual is definitely extinct.

What remains is the Muscovite with his vague ancestral heritage. The masses of the people who, molded by Soviet schools, produce the new human being, until quite recently lived and thought after the Muscovite pattern. The most radical ideological upheaval is powerless wholly to remake a spiritual mold. In the internationalist, the Marxist of today, whoever he may be, it is easy to recognize the village lad, the factory worker, as we remember them from the turn of the century. Paradoxical as it may sound, *homo Europaeo-Americanus* seems closer to Muscovy than to the more recent Petersburg era. The paradox is easily explained. *Homo Europaeo-Americanus* has little claim on the rich heritage of Europe's culture. He emerged in Europe in the period of her barbarization and assimilated a civilization already narrowed down to its athletic, technical, military contents. The savage of our time, technician or athlete, is the product of the disintegration of ancient culture going hand in hand with the absorption of barbarians into the civilized world. The Muscovite who, biding his time in rural Russia, outlasted two centuries of imperial culture, does not need any great effort to keep step with a Europe that has come to curse the last two centuries of her history. What might seem really amazing is the ease with which religion has been repudiated. But this is a special, highly complex theme. As to everything else, the Muscovite lout only had to be shaken up and kicked around for a while, to be jolted out of his indolence and sluggishness. What the tsarist barracks once did to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Church. In these protest movements on the folk level, demand for acceptance on equal terms in an all-human brotherhood of men was emphasized.

In the meantime, with the increasing technological, economic, and intellectual advance of the West, the Western pressures against the Czardom were intensified. In order to meet this challenge and withstand the threat, the Czardom, by the time of Peter the Great, embarked on a series of reforms aimed at Westernization of the Empire, such as secularization of the State, bureaucratization, industrialization and mass education. As a result of such developments, a new elite of parvenu salaried bureaucracy, and of parvenu salaried military, distinguished by the rank and not by the possession of land, was gradually taking the place of the old service nobility as the main pillar of the Czardom. At the same time, the old nobility who were freed of their obligatory service to the State, became hereditary owners of their estates.

In this manner, the old service nobility evolved into a class of economically independent landed squires, even though losing their former political status and privileges, such as monopoly on land and on service. This new gentry however, were by tradition, upbringing, and personal traits, interested in ruling, in political and military careers, not in land cultivation or industry. Many of them, when without office, tended to lead a life of leisure, and to emulate Western manners and styles, to cultivate arts and letters and to indulge in philosophical speculation and formulation of political theories. Few showed an inclination to identify themselves with the productive strata of the population and to devote time and energy to improve techniques of economic production and management.

Such an attitude of the nobility was an important agent in the retarded economic growth of Russia and in the lack of development of a numerically strong and influential middle class, which might have served as a cementing force in a culturally and ideologically split society. And it was from among this leisured class of rural gentry who had lost their status as the main pillar of the Czardom, but who had also emancipated themselves from their economic dependency upon the Czar, that the first

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

leaders of an organized opposition to the Czarist autocracy were recruited.

By the nineteenth century, this landed gentry opposition to the Czarist regime took two main forms. One was pro-Western, seeking the reconstruction of the Czardom along humanistic, libertarian and juridical lines, brought about by the ideas of Humanism and Renaissance, by the Reformation and by the French and American Revolutions. The other was anti-Western, reacting against Western rationalism and materialism, against Western "heathenism" and cosmopolitanism, and against the Western system of impersonal formalism and open class strife which was beginning to infiltrate Russia.

In an attempt to bridge the widening cultural and ideological chasm between the ruling classes and the common folk, the anti-Westerners exalted the anarchic community relations and equalitarian and humanist values of the Old-Slavonic world and of the Russian peasant commune. But they also emphasized the value of the Church-State unity, and sought a Messianic redemption of the whole world through the absorption of the State by the Orthodox Church and reestablishment of a paternalistic system of community relations ruled by collective conscience and based on Christian love and compassion.

In the meantime, that is, by the second part of the nineteenth century, with the growing impoverishment of the rural gentry and with increasing educational opportunities for all strata of the population, the ranks of the educated classes (*intelligentsia*) were being swollen by many declassed people as well as by increasing numbers of young people from the families of clergymen, of lower government employees, of petty tradesmen and other lower classes (*raznochintsy*). Even though Czardom at the time was still governmentalized to a high degree, it was not totally regimented. Moreover, by the second part of the nineteenth century, under the pressure of the West, and in order to match the military, the educational, the industrial and the social levels of the Western world, Czardom abolished serfdom and made other concessions in the direction of a libertarian and a juridical state. This trend of events reinforced the penetration of Western political and social philosophies which tended

6: Tomasic E-4, (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

[XIX century]

517 178 177 565

to undermine the existing Church, State and family system based on self-abnegation and on unconditional submission.

As a result,[1] a number of raznochintsy intelligentsia, freed of fear and awe before God, the Czar and the Father, but feeling thwarted in their political ambitions and socially rejected, expressed their dissatisfaction and their hostility toward the existing conditions of inequality and oppression by developing ideologies of denial and destruction. Their aim was to reject and to annihilate all the basic institutions and authorities on which Czardom rested: the family, religion, property, the power of the Father, the authority of the Church, as well as the rule of the Czar. These revolutionaries denied God and conscience as well as any existing ethics or rules of conventional conduct. They sought to destroy Czardom "root and branch" and to seize power for themselves by all and any means. Their professed objective was to establish on the earth an all-human stateless society of totally free men living in a system of equalitarian justice and fraternal love.

517 668

Thus, while seeking to reestablish the anarchic and group-oriented values of the early Slav folk and of the Russian peasant commune, these revolutionaries exhibited also Messianic power-centered urges and destructive drives common in the ruling classes of Czardom. Hence a number of these people became professional conspirators, advocating establishment of an underground organization with rigidly centralized total power commanding expendability of its members, and demanding their complete dedication to the cause of the revolution. They considered this system of organization to be the only effective way to fight the Czarist rule. In this "mortal struggle," these dedicated young men and women tolerated no opposition or differences of opinion, propagated extreme hatred and pitilessness in dealing with all adversaries, organized assassinations, mutinies, strikes and mass risings, thus preparing the ground for the ascendancy of Bolshevism.

The Bolsheviks were a group of professional conspirators. In common with Messianic and power-oriented aims of all raznochintsy, the Bolsheviks endeavored to seize absolute and total power exclusively for themselves, by any and all means, as a way

1 [i.e. at undermining due to penetration of western influences -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

517 668 to bring about an equalitarian and all-human brotherhood of men on a global scale. Seeking to realize these bi-polar objectives, the Bolsheviks have inherited and reinforced the basic contradictions and conflicts between the aspirations of the rulers and those of the subjects which have throughout centuries undermined the stability of Czardom.

668 661 In their effort to perpetuate themselves in power, the Bolsheviks had to remain organized as a ruling elite of professional conspirators and to reinforce dominance-submission relationships in a system of total power concentrated in their hands. To maintain such a political rule, the Bolsheviks had to introduce a system of total dependence of all upon the holders of power and thus to reinforce the attitudes of self-effacement. They also established a planned system of social differentiation and isolation to prevent social intimacy and group solidarity and hence the potentiality of organized opposition to their rule.

668 771 In such conditions, feelings of rejection and traditional longings for an equalitarian and all-human brotherhood of men have been greatly strengthened among the subjects. It is this situation that points out the fundamental weakness of the Soviet system. To counteract the effects of this basic vulnerability of their regime, the Bolsheviks have endeavored to deify the Soviet rulers, have resorted to the damnation and anathema of the Western world, and have embarked on a propaganda campaign for a Messianic redemption of all suffering and exploited humanity. In this manner, the Bolsheviks have been able to appeal to supra-ethnical and supra-personal loyalties and to all-human longings, not unlike a universal church.

[208] The Bolsheviks have also endeavored to build up the morale of their subjects by means of prestige projects, by mythical undertakings, by mass pageantry, mass unanimous voting and large scale militarization. All these devices are conceived as ways to provoke emotional identification of the masses with the Soviet State and to find in this identification a substitute for their yearnings for a community of free and equal men.

642 665 Total dominance and total submission relationships which have to be maintained to perpetuate this conspiratorial system of power have introduced other basic strains and stresses in the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ture was detrimental to the development of trade and industry. For centuries its economy remained founded on a system of primitive agriculture. Lack of large centers of trade and industry adversely affected rural economy. There was no stimulation for agricultural improvements and for freeing of the serfs. Instead, the emphasis was on the exploitation of serf labor as the most expedient means to satisfy the demands of the landlords and of the state. The landlords were mostly absent on military campaigns or other state duties and were generally disinterested in land improvements. At the same time the system of using the land as a pay for military or other state services, in a country whose war campaigns and military contingents were increasing, tended to diminish the size of the donations and increase the burdens imposed on the serfs.

The lack of urbanization, together with the low standard of education of the service nobility, kept also the intellectual development of Russia far behind that in the West. Intellectual activity was limited mainly to the court circles. The ideology and practices of the Russian Church favored intellectual stagnation. Russia accepted Christianity from Byzantium after the Greek Church had already given up classical traditions of Hellenism. By the time Byzantine Christianity entered Russia, Byzantine literature had assumed an almost exclusively ecclesiastical character, and education consisted almost entirely of religious teaching and the reading of the lives of the saints. Art, too, became exclusively religious and stereotyped. All thought was regimented according to religious dogmas and political objectives of the power-holders.

In Russia this type of intellectual rigidity and inactivity was emphasized because of the use of the Old-Slavonic language in the Church, which resulted in neglect of Greek language. And it was considered a sin to learn the "thrice accursed Latin tongue." Thus, the Russian clergymen became isolated from the West because they lacked the possession of the only instruments in which human knowledge was communicated in those days. Moreover, Russian Orthodoxy, like the Byzantine Orthodoxy, was based on monasticism. But unlike the manifold monastic practices of the Western Church, the monks in the Russian

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Dobrolyubov]

humiliating treatment which Dobrolyubov experienced at the hands of his father. As a reaction to such a family situation, Dobrolyubov developed strong needs for emotional attachment and felt very disillusioned and deeply embittered when his need for dependency was frustrated. When he was sixteen years of age this "forerunner of Bolshevism" wrote in his diary:

> No matter how many attachments I had formed in the past, always the evil fate would whisk the beloved being far away from me; and in my soul remains only the sorrowful memory and bitter realization of my despair . . . I could never live without love, without attachment to someone. This has been so ever since I remember myself. But this constant irony of fate, which makes all my hopes and dreams usually crash into dirt, constantly hardens and chills my heart, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that soon it will be both hard and cold as stone.[5]

Later, apparently, Dobrolyubov found an outlet for his repressed hostilities, in his writings in which he tended to emphasize the dark sides of Russian society ("Realm of Darkness"). He joined that group of "Nihilists" who excelled in their philosophy of extreme individualism, who attacked the existing society and devised the ways to destroy "coldbloodedly" its very foundations, including the family. It was in this ideology of "Nihilism" that Russian Anarchism as well as Bolshevism have been rooted.

The demand for unlimited power as a means of compensation for humiliations and deprivations and as a means of satisfying craving for acceptance and support tends to perpetuate a political system which gives one a chance to indulge such needs through relationships of absolute dominance and unconditional submission and through destructive action. Such a social and political structure, in its own turn, tends to reinforce paternal despotism and absolute obedience in the family. In this manner, just as in the society of steppe marauders, power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression are perpetuated, become generalized and are manifested in many social relations.

On the folk level desire for power was manifested, for instance, in the customs connected with childbirth. On that occasion the midwife would place the child on a sheepskin coat or furcoat so

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

12
IDENTIFICATION WITH SUFFERING AND DEMAND FOR ACCEPTANCE

I

WANT of affection and self-pity experienced by a rejected child could be generalized. Identification with a humiliated and suffering mother might foster or reinforce the same tendencies. As a result sympathy is extended to others who suffer and desire might be expressed or action may be taken to alter conditions which cause all human misery. These ideas and attitudes are then strengthened by those patterns of family relationships which stress responsibility of one for well-being and salvation of all and which favor group orientation and social solidarity.

Such family experiences might affect the whole life careers of some people. If these happen to be intellectual and political leaders, their emotional responses could have a significant influence on the course of the intellectual and political history of their countries. Thus, in Russia feelings of rejection and identification with those who suffer gave a strong emotional support to ideologies which sought a Messianic salvation of all suffering humanity.

A number of outstanding literary figures of Russia in the middle of the nineteenth century, such as Herzen, Belinsky, and Nekrasov, demonstrated in their writings a strong aversion for the existing social system in Russia, expressed irreverence for the old values, showed love of new and challenging ideas, and exhibited a remarkable fighting spirit of revolutionary character. At the same time, they all tended to idealize the Russian people, professed great love, enthusiasm and admiration for the common folk and felt a great compassion for the poor and the suffering everywhere. They believed that the main purpose of literature

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Belinsky]
[Nekrasov]
[Herzen]

was to convey to the masses a social message. In their literary essays they stressed the social and political ills of Russia and believed in the Westernization of their country as a way out of its social and political difficulties.

It is reported that Belinsky grew up with the feeling of revolt against the despotism of his father who tyrannized the family. Nekrasov, "at the age of 17 . . . broke with his father whom he detested even as he idolized his mother" . . . And it was Nekrasov who in his writings showed an especially "great and unfeigned compassion for the poor and the suffering" and who "idealized and worshipped the Russian people,"[1] that is, the people who have been exposed to an age long misery. In a similar manner Herzen had generalized his childhood experiences and had transferred his reactions to all human kind. As a child he showed a strong reaction against his "inaccessible" father and a deep sympathy for all those whom his father abused:

> . . . the hushed voices and noiseless steps of the servants were no sign of devotion, but of repression and fear. All impulsiveness and frankness my father disliked and called familiarity; and all display of feeling passed with him for sentimentality. And when this proud old man, with his clear understanding and sincere contempt of mankind, played this part of a passionless judge, whom did he mean to impress by the performance: A woman whose will he had broken, though she never tried to oppose him; a boy whom his own treatment drove from mere naughtiness to positive disobedience; and a score of footmen whom he did not reckon as human beings! . . . Always on his guard, discontented with everyone, he suffered when he saw the feelings he inspired in every member of the household. Smiles died away and talk stopped whenever he came into the room. Stinging mockery and cool contemptuous irony were the weapons which he could wield with the skill of an artist, and he used them equally against us and against the servants. There are few things that a growing boy resents more; and, in fact, up to the time of my imprisonment I was on bad terms with my father and carried on a petty warfare against him, with the men and maids for my allies . . . did I deserve that he should preach even the truth in a manner so repulsive to the heart of youth? His intelligence, chilled by a long life spent in a corrupt society, made him suspicious of all the world; his feelings were not warm and did not crave for reconciliation; and therefore he remained at enmity

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

absolute and unconditional liberty and denial of any laws, conventions or obligations.[2] Ideologies which sought universal salvation and identification with Christ's teaching (Dissent, Slavophilism) had their counterparts in the ideologies which demanded universal destruction and identification with anti-Christ (Nihilism, Terrorism).[3]

Among the intelligentsia a lack of a sense for methodical work, and lack of initiative were combined with preoccupation concerning grandiose and utopian plans on a world scale. There was a noticeable lack of preparation for these programs and a tendency to consider that having made plans was equal to their fulfillment. Such traits were so striking among some intelligentsia that they were given a special name (*Oblomovshtina*).[4]

It is known that a number of outstanding Russian intellectuals have shown a remarkable lack of emotional balance in their behavior. These would often move from one ideological camp into that of their bitter opponents. In ideological controversies no tolerance was shown for the opposite point of view. There was a tendency to treat all in the opposite camp as enemies. "Who is not with us is against us," was the principle applied in theory and practice. Some outstanding Russian intellectuals themselves admitted such traits in their character. Dostoyevsky, for instance, analyzing his own feelings stated: "In all things I go to the uttermost extremes; my life long I have never been acquainted with moderation." Not unlike this self-analysis of Dostoyevsky was that of Bakunin. In his "Confession to the Czar" he said: "There was in my character a radical defect: love for the fantastic, for out-of-the-way, unheard of adventures, for undertakings which open up an infinite horizon and whose end no man can foresee."[5]

According to General Golovine among the army officers there was a "tendency to drunkenness, churlishness and tyranny toward their subordinates," but there were also "many heroes among these negative types," and often a "regular officer showed such readiness to sacrifice himself that his superiors were forced to restrain his excessive ardor."[6] Lack of balance and stability was also reflected in the differences between military units. Often "next to a first class regiment there was another completely worthless."[7]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

593 154 517

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as Dobrolyubov, Ostrovsky, Herzen and Kropotkin were very much impressed by the effect which Russian family atmosphere had in shaping the personality of the Russian people, especially the intelligentsia. Herzen pointed out that in a family in which there was "much to hate and despise, and almost nothing to love and to respect," the psychological development was not full, but warped. In a similar manner Kropotkin explains that people who are brought up in families in which the personal relationships between children and their parents are based not on love and mutual respect but on fear and unconditional submission become both domineering and servile, as well as rebellious:

[861] A child's spirit is weak. It is so easy to coerce it by fear . . . They make the child timid, and they talk to him of the torments of hell. They conjur up before him the sufferings of the condemned, and vengeance of an implacable God . . . and by that habit of submission the thought of the next generation attains this religious twist, which is at once servile and authoritative; for authority and servility walk ever hand in hand. . . . Then the degradation of the ruler and of the judges, of the clergy and of the more or less comfortable classes becomes so revolting that the pendulum begins to swing the other way.[16]

The family environment, however, is itself an integral part of the society to which it belongs and is therefore interacting with it. Hence an understanding of the structure of the whole society, of the view of life, traditional culture and general orientation of its various strata, of the configuration of its interpersonal, institutional and power relationships is necessary in order to explain personality formation and peculiarities of behavior of a people.[17] It is in such a total context that also the direct and the indirect influences of physical environment or of any other "external" pressures might be correctly appraised.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

IV

Ideologies and Movements

14

REVOLT OF THE LAND-OWNING INTELLIGENTSIA (WESTERNISM AND SLAVOPHILISM)

I

IN CONSEQUENCE of the reforms of Peter the Great the dvorianstvo obtained hereditary rights on their lands. At the same time their service to the state ceased to be obligatory. But the traditions of this class consisted of warfare and ruling, not of land cultivation. Thus when this newly formed landed gentry did not have to serve the state, many of them became a leisure class of people who occupied themselves by visiting Western lands, cultivating Western languages and fine arts and studying Western political and social ideologies. Few among these people were inclined to retire to the country and dedicate themselves to the management of their estates. The result of such a trend of events was that a large part of this leisure class people Europeanized themselves and developed high educational and intellectual standards. And it was from this group of a well educated landed gentry who were losing their

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

former role as main instruments of the Czar's power to a parvenu bureaucracy and military that leaders of first opposition movements were recruited.

Even before and during the French Revolution a number of Russian landed nobility became aware of the ideas of the Revolution. They were also becoming increasingly interested in constitutional forms of government in which they could take part in their own right, not depending upon the whims of a despotic monarch. Some of these people even became dissatisfied with serfdom because of its economic inefficiency. They were also becoming increasingly impatient with absolutism because of its oppressive and degrading aspects.

Such ideas and feelings penetrated the officers' corps and a number of this military intelligentsia organized themselves into a secret society and formulated a concrete program for constitutional changes.[1] Some of these people came from high nobility. Others, especially those from the South, were impoverished nobles living on meager officer's salaries. In December, 1825 these people attempted to seize power. However, owing to ideological differences and the traditional factional splits within the dvorianstvo, the attempt of this faction of military intelligentsia to gain power was thwarted.[2] Nevertheless, this uprising of the "Decembrists," though abortive, was the beginning of increasing revolutionary activities of the intelligentsia[3] which finally brought about the overthrow of the Czardom in the Revolution of 1917.

The revolt of the Decembrists was a sign that the Czardom had already gone through such changes in its social structure that a change in its political system was overdue. The most important change in this structure was the formation of a class which, for the first time in Russia's history, became economically independent of the Czar, and which, though economically idle and not always prosperous, became intellectually very alert and also very sensitive to Western ideas.

In accordance with the traditional behavior pattern of Russian nobility, their reactions to the conditions at home and to Western thought tended to develop in the direction of two opposite extremes. One was that of the "Westerners" who were

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

inclined to take a defeatist attitude and who in their defeatism tended to acknowledge little in the achievements of Russia. They took a very negative attitude toward Russia's social and political system, demanded a break with Russia's past and wanted a thorough Westernization of the country.[4]

Another group of this landed gentry tended to idealize the values of the Old-Slavonic culture and those of the pre-Petrine, pre-bureaucratized, pre-secularized, and Holy Russia. These people, who were highly learned according to Western standards, were aware of many of the inadequacies and deficiencies of the Russia of their times. At the same time they feared the expansionistic designs of the West and the infiltration of Western thought, institutions and practices. They were extremely sensitive to the criticism of Russia and the Russian people prevalent in those days among Western scholars and other Western observers.

Apparently as a reaction to such a threat and criticisms, and perhaps also because seeking compensation for their wounded pride, these people resorted to a flight into Russia's past and projected an idealized image of former values of Russia and of Slav people into the future. They were inclined to criticize the political and social system which Peter the Great had introduced and in which he followed Western patterns; they demanded a return to pre-Petrine and Orthodox Russia reestablished in all its former glory. Such a visionary image of Russia enabled these well off landowning intelligentsia to see also themselves regaining the grandeur, the self-respect, the social prestige and the political power which they were rapidly losing to a parvenu military and bureaucratic hierarchy.

These people reacted aggressively against a challenging Western world by over-stressing what they thought were superior qualities of Slavs and superior values of Russian and Slav culture. It was in this manner that a romantic view of Slav folk society and of the Russian man was developed. These ideas left a strong imprint on literature, art, philosophy and political thinking both of the nineteenth and of the twentieth century Russia and became known as "Slavophilism."

Brought up in a patriarchal family system which had condi-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

tioned them to dominance-submission and protection-dependence relationships, but yearning also for the Old-Slavonic anarchic and egalitarian justice, the "Slavophils" tended to idealize especially those institutions in which paternalistic, as well as equalitarian, relationships were well established, but which they saw distintegrating in new circumstances. Such was, for instance, the *mir* institution, according to their view.

According to the Slavophil interpretation, the old Russian and Slav community was founded on the principles of obedience, mutual responsibility, social justice and equality, Christian love and humility.[8] They asserted that the Russian land commune was the foundation of an original and highly satisfactory culture which was exempt from the vices of the Western civilization, untainted with proletarianization, pauperism, and the problem of wages. The mir was an institution in which man felt as an organic and integral part of his community. There was no uncertainty, no insecurity, and no frustrations in that social system since in it the values were absolute and unchallenged.[9]

The Slavophils idealized Russia's patriarchal relationships based on absolute and unchallenged values, on faith and on total fusion of man and community, as contrasted to Western individualism, cosmopolitanism, rationalism and skepticism. They contended that reason, if separated from faith, introduces doubts, splits and conflicts between man and his society. They stressed the organic totality and harmony of the Old-Slavonic and pre-Petrine Russian society in contrast to the materialism and class strife of the West.[7]

The old pre-Petrine order which the Slavophils idealized had greatly depended upon Church support and religious sanction for its perpetuation. The Slavophils therefore feared that Western liberalism which was beginning to penetrate Russia would undermine its religious foundation. As a defense against such demoralizing influences, the Slavophils pointed out that the Western world was rapidly disintegrating because of the spreading of free thought and because of the decline of the faith. The West was a prey to Roman heathenism, they said, and it was from this traditional anti-Christian spirit that revolutions, free thought, the papacy, and the Reformation had sprung.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

According to Slavophils the doom of the Western civilization was sealed when rationalism was allowed to destroy faith. It was then that the human spirit became divided against itself, which meant its disintegration. God and man, intuition and reason, beauty and truth are one, they claimed. As soon as man does not possess such a mystic unity with the absolute, he is plunged into skepticism and disbelief, his reason is separated from his soul and he becomes a "split man."

Owing to the organic totality of his body and soul, of his faith and reason, the Russian man possessed the "inner truth," which is the real truth, as against the "outer truth" or superficial truth of the Westerner, the Slavophils said. Therefore in contrast to the "split man" of the West, the Russian man was a "total man" (*vsechelovek*).[8] In this manner, the Russian man who has achieved his unity with God has achieved also the unity of his nation with God. The Russian nation is therefore a "God-bearing" nation (*Bogonosets*):

> . . . do you know who are the only 'god-bearing' people on earth, destined to regenerate and save the world in the name of a new God, and to whom are given the keys of life and of the new world . . . Do you know which is that people and what is its name?[9]

Aware that without strong religious feelings such a man and society could not exist, and fearing the decline of the old Orthodox-patriarchal values in a bureaucratized and secularized Russia, the Slavophils demanded a return to the old pre-Petrine theocratic system, one in which the Church would absorb the state. In accordance with such an ideology the Slavophils asserted that when the Church has absorbed the state, then the state will ascend and become a Church over the whole world, a Church kingdom ruling over all the earth which is the "glorious destiny ordained for the Orthodox Church."[10]

The Slavophils asserted that the political organization as developed in the West was a system of conquest and force. Being therefore an instrument of oppression, such a political organization was foreign to the Slavs and to the Russian people, and it should not be maintained.[11] In accordance with the anarchic and egalitarian traditions of the Old-Slavonic society, the Slavophils

6: Tomasic 3-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

claimed that the commune should be the main unit of social organization of mankind. In the commune, it was not force or external coerciveness, not the minority or majority rule, but the collective mind, the inner motivations, the principle of unanimity and organic totality that prevailed.[12] It is only by being completely rooted in his own community and completely identified with his own people that man can be creative and can reach all-human ideas, they said.

In such a society in which the state disappears in the Church and in which the commune becomes the basic unit of social organization, instead of external and formal law and authority imposed from above, emotional bonds of unity, self-discipline, informal egalitarian justice and charity will prevail.[13] It is only in such an integrated community which has been fused with the Church and in which the total and organic unity of all members is established that real freedom of the individual can be realized,[14] according to Slavophilism.

Slavophil ideas exerted considerable political influence in Russia and in the rest of the Slav world. Exposed to the growing pressure of imperial designs of Western powers, and embarked on a program of their own imperial expansion in the direction of the Mediterranean and the Pacific, some of Russia's political circles welcomed Slavophil ideas as an ideological justification of Russia's foreign policies. Thus the idea of protection of Orthodox and of Slav peoples,[15] the idea of defense of the Slavs against the encroachments of the Germans and the idea of uniqueness and superiority of Slav culture played an important role in a series of nationalist movements and wars in which Russia became involved since the middle of the nineteenth century.

According to this Pan-Slav movement Russia was the only Christian land, the world outside Russia was "the land of the anti-Christ," the "incorporation of Satan." Accordingly, struggle with the West was not only inevitable, but necessary and salutary, both for Russia and the rest of humankind. And the victory will be undoubtedly on the side of Russia.[16]

For the continuance of its organic life the world required a centre. This centre must be found in a single nation able to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

lead the others. Russia was therefore predestined to fulfill this world mission. Hence the Pan-Slavs looked to Moscow, the ancient Russian capital, not the Westernized "City of Peter" (Petersburg) as the heart of Russia[17] and of mankind of the future—the Third Rome.

15
REVOLT OF THE RAZNOCHINTSY INTELLIGENTSIA (NIHILISM AND ANARCHISM)

I

BY THE second part of the nineteenth century, new changes were taking place in the economic relations as well as in the political and class structure of the Czardom. First of all, the process of disintegration of the old order under the impact of the industrialization and bureaucratization was rapidly coming to an end. Serfdom was abolished and with it there came the disastrous ruin of manorial estates which were not prepared to cope with the difficulties of a money and market economy. The result was that the number of impoverished and pauperized gentry was greatly increased.

At the same time the new laws tended to place emphasis on property. Thus, for instance, in the local assemblies of the noblemen the elective franchise was granted only to noblemen possessing a certain amount of land or a certain value of industrial establishment. This difference in civil rights according to the amount of property introduced a sharp cleavage into the gentry class. Earlier all dvorianstvo and all chinovnichestvo were considered equal in rights and had at least theoretically an equal chance to rise in power or to win the favor of the Czar. But now the new laws disfranchised and declassed a large part of the gentry. Similar laws favored the richer class among the merchants which meant that even in municipal affairs birth and education decreased in value in comparison with wealth.[1]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

668 647 701 554 In a similar manner revolt was brewing in the bureaucracy and the armed forces. In a system which was founded on the principles of absolute dominance, subservience and unconditional submission, it is to be expected that the civil service employees as well as many officers would be often exposed to caprice, arbitrariness and wrong doings on the part of their superiors. These, too, were left without possibility of redress as were the clergymen. Strong sense of rank and social distance were as marked in these strata as among the clergy.

871 565 The lay schools[1] were not much different in strictness and discipline from the priests' seminaries, and students in these schools were often as ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, and as exposed to the rod and other degrading treatment. The student's parents, who were often impoverished gentry, petty chinovniks, or small traders with meager incomes and big families, were not always able to support their children throughout long years of schooling. At the same time in an economically and technologically [555] undeveloped society with strong traditions of service nobility, there was nothing that young people from such families could do but to enroll at a university or a military academy in order to obtain government office, or to engage in free learned professions. In Russian society of those days these were the only possibilities of obtaining positions of some prestige. Many of these students from impoverished strata had therefore to depend upon public or private munificence to finish their studies. Some of them became police informers to secure a meager income and to finish schooling. Many had to drop out of school because of lack of financial resources.

871 668 All Russian schools, therefore, on the middle as well as on the university level, became centers of revolt against an order which exposed them to humiliating treatment, but did not offer them opportunities in accordance with the established traditions of higher classes. Hence the higher the school, the more it was imbued with the revolutionary spirit. And the words "student" and "revolutionary" became synonymous.

517 647 641 When new laws were introduced and these ambitious and rebellious young men and women finally entered state service they found that in addition to being ill-treated and ill-paid, a

[1] [i.e. in the second half of the XIX th century — Analyst]

& Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

large part of them were disfranchised as well, because in municipal self-government and in district and provincial assemblies even persons holding university degrees, if they did not own a sufficient amount of property, were devoid of the right of suffrage.[4] And it was this underprivileged group of declassee nobility, of priests' sons, of former clerics, of sons and daughters of lower government employees, of unemployed professionals, of students and of former students who never had a chance to finish their studies, that became known as the *raznochintsy*.

The raznochintsy intelligentsia tended to lead a bohemian life and to engage in literary activities and journalism. But these vocations were greatly limited because of strict censorship laws. When the bar was established some raznochintsy practiced law as barristers, though they were very restricted in their activities because of traditional extra legal practices of the police. When under local self-administration (*Zemstvo*), a health, educational, and economic program for the improvement of rural areas was developed, a number of raznochintsy were employed by the Zemstvo as physicians, veterinarians, agronomists, teachers and bookkeepers. At the same time, their traditions and training, and especially their ambitions and expectations had conditioned the raznochintsy for intellectual pursuits and political leadership, not for routine administrative work or for business promotion and enterprise.

In such a situation the deeply rooted feeling of rejection which had been developed on the family level was greatly magnified.[5] Accordingly, self-centeredness, power-seeking, lack of trust, destructive aggression, as well as identification with suffering which were developed on the family level were heightened in these circumstances and found expression in ideologies which manifested extreme hostility and an urge for universal destruction. Many of these young rebels, for instance, denied all existing social institutions, conventions and restrictions, and demanded their total obliteration.

This ideology of extreme negation and destruction ("Nihilism") manifested, perhaps, the feelings of utter despair of the ambitious and self-seeking raznochintsy who felt impotent before the God-like power of the Czar and his omnipotent police.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Thwarted in their drive for power and political leadership, these young men and women gave vent to their feelings of deprivation in phantasies and plans of destruction and death.

Much of the sadness, tragic sarcasm, morbidity and preoccupation with death and suffering which dominated Russian literature in the second part of the nineteenth century reflects such moods of despair. The predominance of social and political themes in the literary creations of these people and the insistence of literary critics of those days on literary "realism," that is, that a work of art should be judged not by artistic and esthetic criteria but by its portrayal of existing life and its faithfulness to reality, especially the brutal and dark reality, manifested the same feelings.

Pisarev, describing this psychological reaction of impotence and the urge for destruction before seemingly uncontrollable forces, stated that when men "find it impossible to transform life, their anger at their own impotence makes itself felt in the sphere of thought, where the destructive work of criticism proceeds unceasingly."[6] That the basic drive behind this urge for negation and destruction was extreme self-seeking is witnessed by some other ideas of the same writer. "Every living being," said Pisarev, "is for himself the center and the meaning of the universe . . . his personal joys, vexations, aspirations, and cares, are more important than universal revolutions. . . ."

Starting with such premises, some of the Nihilists refused to recognize any regulation, any moral law, any principle, whether above, external, or within a person as being "absolute." The result was preaching of extreme materialism and individualism, and denial of all "absolute" ethics, of duty and of responsibility, of ideals and of social values.

II

In the meantime, however, the effects of European revolutions of 1848 and the defeats of the Russian armies in the Crimean War (1854–1856) led some of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia to the belief that the Czarist system was not as invulnerable as generally accepted. These people proposed direct and organized action against the Czarist regime in order to raze it to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

the ground together with all its fundamental institutions. Such plans for direct action aimed at total destruction of the existing order were developed by the Anarchists ("Our task is terrible, total, inexorable, and universal destruction".)[7]

Not unlike the Slavophils and the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against the existing formal law which was abused for personal gains of those in power. Just as the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against the family institution whose sacredness in Russian society often veiled arbitrariness, cruelty, injustices, and humiliations imposed by the elders upon the weak and unprotected. Like the Slavophils and the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against private property, the official Church, and the state because these institutions in the Czardom joined hands in supporting the system of serfdom and bureaucratic regimentation. "The only revolution which can do any good to the people is that which destroys, from top to bottom, every idea of the state, overthrowing all traditions, social orders, and classes. . . ."[8]

The Anarchists demanded a return to an anarchic and equalitarian brotherhood that strongly reminds one of the Old-Slavonic world. But following the patriarchal and Czarist traditions of unconditional power and dominance, the Anarchists, just as the Nihilists, usurped for themselves the right to cheat, to steal, to lie, to destroy, and to kill, as a means to do away with "deceit, cunning, exploitation, depravity, vice," of the ruling classes. Said Kropotkin:

> I will be immoral to snap a weapon abused by religion; I will do it, were it only to protest against the hypocrisy imposed on us in the name of a word to which the name morality was given.[9]

"The revolutionary defines as moral only that which assists the revolution, and defines as immoral and criminal that which stands in his way," says the *Catechism of Revolution*. In the same manner, Kropotkin, speaking of the Russian terrorists who assassinated Czar Alexander II, said that "these men and women . . . had conquered the right to kill. . . . 'They have the right to steal' . . ."[10]

In order to be able to destroy, to cheat, and to kill the exploiters and the representatives of the government, it was neces-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

sary to know how to hate them. The Anarchists therefore undertook to find ways by which extreme hatred could best be promoted. This, they said, should be done first by arousing passionate and uncompromising love for equality and freedom and becoming ready to suffer and to sacrifice oneself for these ideas; then by instilling burning hatred and urge of destruction of those who stand in the path of these objectives. "The terrorist," said Stepniak, "is noble, terrible, irresistibly fascinating for he combines in himself two sublimities of human grandeur: the martyr and the hero."[11] Such a revolutionary will "not hesitate to destroy any position, any place, or any man in this world. He must hate everyone and everything with an equal hatred."[12]

Ambivalence of hatred and love and justification of violence for the sake of salvation of others had their roots in the family and were reinforced by conditions in the society at large. Identification with suffering, guilt feelings, desire for martyrdom and self destruction had the same roots and reinforcements. On the ideological level of Anarchism these feelings and attitudes were formulated into principles of thought and action:

> . . . we do not forego our own capacity to love what seems to us good and to hate what seems to us bad. Love and hate, for only those who know how to hate know how to love . . . We only ask one thing, e.c. to eliminate all that impedes the free development of those two feelings in the present society, all that perverts our judgment: the state, the church, exploitation; judges, priests, government, exploiters . . .[13]

But since the primary sources of this ideology and conduct were feelings of rejection, hate and killing took the upper hand over love. Accordingly the Anarchists demanded severance of the relations with the rest of the society and complete dedication to destruction. "The revolutionary has broken all ties with society." He "should have no . . . attachments, no property and no name. All these must be wholly absorbed in the single thought and the single passion for revolution."[14]

Detachment from the rest of the society promoted self-pity and therefore reinforced destructive aggressiveness both against the others and against the self. Renouncement of all ethical, moral or other consideration in dealing with adversaries, pitiless-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ness and ruthlessness both toward themselves and toward those who were not with them became in this manner an integral part of the revolutionary movement in Russia.[15] On such foundations a "science of merciless destruction" was developed:

> The revolutionary is wholly dedicated. He must show no mercy to the State or towards the civilized classes of society; nor does he ask for mercy for himself. Between him and society there is waged a mortal war declared or concealed, a relentless and irreconcilable fight to the death. He must accustom himself to torture.
>
> Tyrannical towards himself, the revolutionary must be tyrannical towards others. All the emotions that move human beings, all the soft and enervating feelings of kinship, love, friendship, gratitude and honor, must give way to a cold and single-minded passion for revolution. For him there exists only one pleasure, one consolation, one reward, one satisfaction—the success of the revolution. Night and day he must have but one thought, but one aim—merciless destruction. Coldly, relentlessly, he pursues his aim, and he must be prepared to perish himself, as he must be prepared to destroy with his own hands those who stand in his way.[16]

A revolutionary organization engaged in a life and death struggle with the rest of society precluded any internal disagreement. Bakunin, for instance, conceived a secret organization with a disciplined membership, a system of strict control of its members, and a rigidly centralized authority vested in one man only. Bakunin's secret society was to consist of three separate and independent groups which would function under different names and would be unacquainted with one another. Each one of these three groups was to operate in a different stratum of society. But each group was to be subject to a rigid hierarchy of power and each member of the group subjected to unconditional obedience to his superiors.

These secret societies were to be limited to a small number of people and were to include, as far as possible, only able, experienced, energetic, and influential men, professional conspirators, who, in strict obedience to a central control would lead the masses. All three secret societies were to be coordinated by a central committee which would have consisted of Bakunin and of three or four other members selected by him. Bakunin wanted

By the end of that century[1] a faction of Russian radical intelligentsia fused the Russian Narodnik and Anarchist ideologies and practices with those of Western Socialism and formed the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries. The program of this Party was agrarian socialism and terrorism. They published leaflets and manifestos, and spread their ideas in the villages. The Socialist Revolutionaries preached open violence as a means of overthrowing the Czarist regime. They relied on the peasantry to start uprisings against the landlords and government officials, and to commit individual acts of terror to achieve their ends. Just as earlier, the Anarchists and Terrorists, the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, had a separate organization which specialized in perpetrating acts of terror:

> Where the lash and the whip are, there are also the bomb and the revolver! So has it been, so is it now, and so shall it be. When public indignation and hate become centered upon an agent of the regime whether he be placed high or low; when that agent becomes a symbol of violence and despotism; when his activity becomes harmful to the commonweal; when no means are available to render him harmless and his continued existence represents an affront to the social conscience, then is the door open to terror in the executor of the sentence pressed from the hearts of public-minded citizens.[7]

The terroristic organization of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries enjoyed complete autonomy within the Party. It had its own sources of revenue and was independent in selection of prospective victims. In the course of a few years of its existence it perpetrated more than two hundred acts of terror. Most of these consisted of assassinations or of attempted assassinations of highly placed officials of the government, including a member of the Imperial Family, two Ministers of Interior, thirty-nine governors, seventy-four ranking officers of the army and the navy, and fifty-two high police officials. Seventy percent of these acts of terror were perpetrated by workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors.[8]

The Socialist Revolutionaries relied mainly on middle and poor peasant strata. They attempted to widen the gap between the better-off and the poor, to set up the lowest strata against the upper, to stir class hatred against the kulaks. In their manifestos, leaflets, and speeches, the Socialist Revolutionaries harangued

[1] [i.e. 19th century — Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

self. And after the army which Czar Nicholas personally commanded in 1917 had suffered defeats at the hands of the enemies, and the chiefs of the armed forces suggested to the Czar that he should resign, he realized that his prestige had fallen and his authority gone. As out of spite he abdicated not only for himself but for his heirs as well. And as it has already happened in Russia's past, when the central authority suffered defeat and loss of prestige, all seething internal forces of revolt, relieved of the controls that kept them under check, burst out in violent eruptions. In such circumstances everybody deserted the Czar, even the Orthodox Church:

> Even the Orthodox Clergy, that class that had been an integrated part of the Czarist system deserted the Czar in the hour of his doom. Showing as much lack of a sense of proportion as the other classes of Russian society the official hierarchy went as far as to pass a decision according to which all lines containing the word "king" in the Psalms of David were to be deleted.[13]

III

All these circumstances, combined with the extreme factionalism within the intelligentsia, greatly facilitated the seizure of the power by the Bolsheviks. All the four national *Dumas* which were convoked since 1905 were composed predominantly of the intelligentsia and semi-intelligentsia. The same situation existed in the leading circles of all political parties.[14] But in each party, self-centeredness and lust for power led the intelligentsia into constant bickering among themselves and neverending fighting for leadership, a situation that manifested itself in numerous party splits.

It was only in the Bolshevik Party that the Party's Central Committee was well disciplined and unified under one leader who had absolutist and dictatorial powers. This situtation spared the Party too many splits. This Bolshevik system favored the reduction of Party leadership to a rather small number of intellectuals who relied on the semi-intelligentsia and industrial workers in local Party work. It was this dictatorial, centralistic and "aristocratic" organization of the Bolsheviks, as well as the extreme ruthlessness and aggressiveness of its leaders and fanat-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

565 icism of its rank and file, that gave this Party an advantage over
517 its main rival for power, the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries, in the chaotic days of 1917.

727 Just as it had happened in the past, a weakening of the prestige
669 of the ruling classes as a result of defeats on the battlefield led
565 to peasant uprisings. Almost immediately after the Czar's abdication, that is, in March, 1917, peasant rebellions arose in 34 districts and by June spread to 325 districts. The distrubances were again especially intensive in the upper Don and in the middle Volga, the regions where the tradition of revolt was strong and the situation for revolt matured owing to unsatisfactory conditions within the land communes.

665 The chaos that ensued in the village was emphasized by fac-
669 tional strife and indecision in the center. As a result of the fall of the old Czarist regime, the two most extreme revolutionary parties, the Socialist Revolutionaries and the Bolsheviks, entered into a contest for power. While the Socialist Revolutionaries controlled the Provisional Government (since May, 1917), the Bolsheviks did everything to undermine their regime and to seize the power for themselves. In the question of rural policies, the government of Socialist Revolutionaries attempted to stop the outbreaks of lawlessness and disorder in the villages by promising an equitable solution of all rural problems on the basis of laws that were to be passed by a Constitutional Assembly.

[425] But the Bolsheviks counteracted such policies by inciting the peasants to seize the lands at once. The Bolsheviks also deliber-
[565] ately sharpened the existing social cleavages in the villages by inciting the lower peasant strata against the upper. The Bolshevised soldiers, on leave or deserting the front, pushed more moderate elements into the background and led the peasant mobs not only against the landlords, but also against the more prosperous peasant classes. Hence, attacks on *Khutoryane* (hereditary peasant homestead owners) and *otrubniki* (peasant individual property owners) were as frequent as those against the manorial estates.

Many soldiers deserted the front because the Bolshevik agitators told them that the land was being distributed back home and that those who were present would get the choice grounds. The government, controlled by the Socialist Revolutionaries,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

much possibility for self-expression, creativeness and personal satisfaction.[24]

On the other hand an atmosphere of domineering and vigilantism offers a great opportunity for advance to the fanatic Party member as well as to the ambitious and unscrupulous careerist within the labor ranks, and the ranks of technicians and engineers. Even among those managers and foremen who might otherwise have different inclinations, the need to maintain their positions often forces them towards a policy of vigilantism, cynicism and oppressive labor driving.

22
INSTRUMENTS OF POLITICAL CONFORMITY

I

THE SYSTEM of dominance, based on economic dependence, social isolation and lack of trust, which has enabled the Bolsheviks to monopolize all social power, has helped them also to force the intellectual strata into unconditional submission to the will of the ruling minority. Just as the land has been collectivized and industrial production governmentalized to make the peasants and the industrial labor dependent upon the Party, so all sources of income in the intellectual fields have been monopolized by the Party-state to make the intellectuals completely dependent for their lives and livelihoods upon the ruling faction of the Bolsheviks. The office tenure of this new service nobility has been conditioned upon their blind submission to the rulers in the Kremlin, just like in the days of the old dvorianstvo.

The educated strata are of a special strategic importance from the point of view of self-perpetuation of the Bolsheviks in power, because it is these strata that provide ideological and political leadership and Party cadres. The party has endeavored therefore to make the intelligentsia even more socially split and dependent

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

upon the regime than the peasantry and industrial labor. The objective of this policy has been to prevent among the intelligentsia formation of an *esprit de corps* and opposition to Bolshevik rule, and to command the services and unquestionable obedience of every educated man. These are the political foundations of the growing and deliberately fostered stress on rank and distinction, on social differentiation, sense of superiority and inferiority, absolute superordination and blind subordination.

In the upper strata, much more so than in the lower classes, the process of hierarchal and functional differentiation is fostered and maintained not only by means of specialization of work and differences in rank, but also by means of sharply differentiated income, and by means of differential distribution of spoils, and of privileges. This sharp stratification of Soviet society, rooted in the traditions of the Czardom, in its own turn promotes power-seeking and domineering, dependency and subservience, as well as lack of social intimacy and lack of trust.

The highest privileges in the Soviet society are accruing to the top ruling faction of professional conspirators. But this group is itself internally sharply differentiated. It is headed by the Party Leader (*Vozhd*), and is divided into a number of policy making bodies, among which the Political Bureau (Politburo), now to be known as the Presidium,[1] is of foremost importance. Though the members of the Presidium and of other top policy making bodies, such as the Secretariat, are formally appointed by the Central Committee of the Party, they are *de facto* selected by the supreme leader and therefore depend upon him for their position. Such a situation fosters bickering among top ranking officials in their mutual struggle to win the favors of the head man, which in turn enables the supreme Party leader to play one faction of his camarilla against the other one or—not unlike in the days of the Czars—to select a more intimate inner circle of a few most trusted persons on whom to rely for advice and help. These then assist the leader in selecting and in eliminating the members of the top ranking hierarchy, according to expediency and circumstances.

This highly concentrated power structure is supported by a

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

They believe that politics is the business of the government, the business of the Central Committee, and as for the writers that their business is not to interest themselves in politics. They believe that if a man wrote well, artistically, and beautifully, one should let it go, in spite of the rotten passages which disorientate our youth and poison it. We demand that our comrades, both the supervisors of literature and the writers themselves must be guided by something without which the Soviet regime cannot exist, and that is politics. Lenin wrote: "Literature must become Party-minded . . . Against bourgeois literary careerism and individualism . . . socialist proletariat must put forward the principle of party literature . . ." Comrade Stalin described our literati as the engineers of human souls. It is necessary therefore that our literature, our literary magazines, . . . should help the Party and the people to educate the youth in the spirit of supreme devotion to the Soviet regime . . .[16]

Special attention is paid in this respect to dramatic art because of its popularity and effect. It is stated therefore that "a playwright must be a politician" and that the producer and actor must be "politicians" of the same stature. Appointment of a group of actors for a Soviet play "is a political question for the producer . . . and how the hero must be played in a Soviet play is a political question for the actor."[17] In the same manner in painting, sculpture and music the Party demands "Soviet realism" which means that the artists and the musicians must have recourse to "topical themes and images of contemporary Soviet reality" and must discard "formalistic trickery and subjectivist insularity."[18]

Accordingly any alien, especially Western, influence on Soviet thinking must be completely eliminated. Western philosophy of liberalism and free individual expression could undermine Bolshevik endeavors to create a completely regimented and submissive "new man." Hence a crusade against "cosmopolitanism, objectivism and other manifestations of bourgeois ideology"[19] has been initiated together with the severance of all closer contacts of Soviet intellectuals with the Western world.[20]

Such policies of complete subordination of one's thoughts, feelings and behavior to the needs of the Party demand not only strict censorship of all published matter[21] but dictate even the use of statistics to suit the objectives of the ruling class. A ruling

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

There is also a deliberate policy on the part of the ruling class
177 626 609 to prevent personal contact and exchange of ideas between the Soviet subjects and the foreigners. In this way the Bolshevik Party is performing the same role in the social and psychological development of Russia as the Orthodox Church has done in the past. Xenophobia and a deliberate avoidance of strangers easily develops in such circumstances, traits which have been noticed by all the observers of Soviet society. Xenophobia is so outstanding in the Soviet world that it has been noticed even by the most casual and most friendly visitors. Soviet authorities have done their best to encourage this feeling. "We were completely cut off [625] from the great bulk of the Russian people by constant police surveillance, by propaganda and by the threat of punishment."[7] "The air itself was clothed with hate and suspicion . . . penetrated even to the child world. . . . Our next door neighbours, too, were grilled, and though we had known them for years, they took to avoiding us utterly."[8] As a rule, only police informers are assigned to foreigners as servants because everyone else is afraid to work for them.

517 647 In such conditions original ideas and independent intellectual pursuits are fraught with great risks and it is often the less original, the mediocre, the cynical, the shrewd and the unscrupulous that take the lead. Some independent and creative people in such circumstances tend to become apathetic, to withdraw, to sever social contacts and put an end to their creative activities.[9] Others tend to seek safety in bureaucratic routine and in avoidance of initiative and responsibility. For each decision they tend to cover themselves by presenting the matter to various committees, or by seeking the Party's advice, thus letting others shoulder the responsibility.

517 665 The social consequences of such a development are then manifested in a pronounced anti-intellectualism, bureaucratism and vigilantism. The ascendancy of anti-intellectualistic and watchdog trends in Soviet society is well expressed, for instance, in the change in the composition of the membership of the Politbure. In this topmost ruling body the more intellectual types of revolutionaries have been gradually purged and replaced by the activists, the semi-educated professional conspirators, Party organizers, agitators and former security officials.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

The trend toward pauperization of the intellect which develops in such a society will be emphasized the more when that society is bent upon increasing war preparedness. In such a case, particularly when faced with low labor productivity, the ruling faction will need to mobilize all available intellectual resources for its political and for its military objectives; basic research and many fields of knowledge not directly related to such objectives will have to be neglected and might even be completely paralyzed.

But dogmatism and lack of free criticism, anti-intellectualism and vigilantism lead to stagnation not only in the fields of theory, basic research, and art, but also in the fields of applied science, including political and military affairs. Even if industry, state administration and military science could conceivably make substantial advance on the basis of regimented, conscripted, and convict labor, they must be constantly fed with new ideas and inventions both in the field of technology, and in the field of organization to keep pace with the industrial and military development in the free enterprise countries which are looked upon as potential enemies.

The Bolshevik rulers are well aware of this problem. In Soviet publications it is often pointed out that various scientific institutes established to develop applied science in the field of industry and agriculture do not fulfill their plans, fail to assure proper cooperation, work on "secondary problems" and neglect questions of "vital importance." High cash prizes known as Stalin Premiums have been offered each year to stimulate the work on such problems of "vital importance." Nevertheless the Bolsheviks had to a great extent to rely on acquiring essential blueprints from abroad either by purchase or by intelligence.

In Czarist Russia a certain degree of criticism in civil and military matters was allowed while a considerable degree of criticism existed in philosophical, literary, and historical fields. The all-powerful Czarist bureaucracy was often very anxious to accept the ideas put forward by the opposition. Many reforms in the Czarist administration in the direction of liberalism and democratization originated in the leading minds of the opposition. The opposition was often able to express their views in

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

newspapers, books, and pamphlets, some of which were printed abroad and circulated freely though often clandestinely among the leading circles of the Empire.

The ruling circles of the Bolshevik Party themselves were always aware that without criticism intellectual stagnation, lack of creative initiative, and bureaucratism would set in. But they could not afford to allow complete freedom of thought and of expression which might eventually undermine their own power. As a result the Bolsheviks introduced a system of "criticism and self-criticism," known as *samokritika*.

According to this practice it is the duty of every Soviet subject to criticize his own work and the work of others in his shop or office as a means of stimulating alertness, initiative, and hard work, and as a way to correct errors. But among the officials who closely watch each other's activities, each hoping to rise on the cadaver of the other, samokritika is often used as a means of intrigue and ruin in jockeying and struggling for ranks, positions, and power. Samokritika therefore has developed into a weapon employed to detect the ideological deviations and diversions and to criticize any lack of sufficiently positive attitude toward the "Party line." In this manner "self-criticism" in the Soviet Union has become another instrument of regimentation and means to increase conformity.

Samokritika is also employed by the ruling circles to manipulate hostilities generated by the Soviet system and to direct them away from themselves and against the managers and bureaucrats located mostly on the lower levels of the Soviet social pyramid. These people conveniently function as scapegoats. It is such people who, together with a sprinkling from the higher echelons, are periodically offered as sacrifice and "purged" or "liquidated." Samokritika is therefore employed also as a check against abuses of power, though mostly on the local level.

In an atmosphere of complete dependence upon and subordination to an overwhelming and infallible power which instils fear and awe, the slightest deviation from the line of thought and emotions as laid down by that distant and inscrutable force might easily provoke anxieties, and a strong sense of guilt. In circumstances in which one feels isolated and without support,

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

dissenters, in the civil wars as well as in the struggle between the Czarist police and the revolutionary intelligentsia; it was even formulated as an ideology and became a credo of Anarchism.

In the Bolshevik ideology this anti-humanism is justified by representing the "enemies" as not being human beings. Just as in the folk attitudes toward enemy aliens, the oppositionists and the adversaries, actual and potential, real and imaginary, are identified in Bolshevik writings with "gnats," "insects," "reptiles," "dogs," "wild beasts," and "beasts of prey." It is by such ways of reasoning that the Soviet pedagogists have come to the assertion that indoctrination of the people with "burning hatred" of the enemy does not contradict the ideas of humanism, because, they claim, the ideas of humanism and humane feelings do not apply to beasts. In this manner even acts of cruelty toward the "enemies" are condoned and encouraged:

> Hatred of the enemies of the socialist Motherland by no means contradicts the principles of humanism, since it is devoted to the protection of the rights and liberty of the worker from the designs of beasts of prey.[24]

The need for such an appeal to extreme animosities against the adversaries is in itself an indication of instability of the Bolshevik system. The ruling faction had to resort to such a means in order to promote complete identification with and fanatical devotion to the Cause and to the Leader. Here, however, we see a noticeable difference between the Czardom and the Soviet Russia. Though the Czarist system often exhibited aspects of extreme ruthlessness, the whole ideological and intellectual development of the Czarist Russia, especially in the last century of its existence, was in the direction of increasing Westernization and humanization. This trend coincided with certain gains in the field of personal, economic, and cultural freedoms in the Czardom.

As a result terrorism and acts of violence, though widely practiced, were not openly advocated as official Czarist policy. Many moderate and conservative factions of the intelligentsia strongly denounced all acts of terror performed either by the government or under the auspices of the revolutionary intelligentsia. One

7: Lineva B-5 (no date) 1893 RF1 Great Russia RF1

A Note on Russian Folk-Music.

517 "To husband and wife it (song) suggests many a form of loving words, and teaches them how, with croons about the evil Tartars of olden days, to lull their babies to sleep and to soothe restlessness of their elder children. Song lightens the toil of the working hours, whether carried on out of doors, amid exposure to sun and wind, and rain and frost, or within the stifling hut, by the feeble light of a pine wood splinter; it enlivens the repose of the holiday, giving animation to the choral dance by day and the social gathering at night. The younger generation grows up, and song escorts the conscript son to the army, the wedded daughter to her new home, and mourners over the sorrow of the parents of whom their children have taken what may be a last farewell. Then comes the final scene of all, and when the tired eyes are closed forever, and the weary hands are crossed in peace, song hovers around the silent form, and addresses to its heedless ears passionate words of loving entreaty. Nor does its ministering stop even then, for, as each returning spring brings back the memory of the past, together with fresh hopes for the future, song rises again above the graves of the departed, as, after the fashion of their pagan ancestors, the villagers celebrate their yearly memorial of the dead."

IT IS thus that Ralston describes the part which the people's songs play in the social and domestic economy of the Russians. In his words there is nothing of extravagance or hyperbole. Each of the incidents mentioned is to be understood as an episode of great significance in the regular cycle of Russian family life. Music accompanies these people literally, not only from the cradle to the grave, but beyond the grave, being a leading feature in certain post-burial ceremonies which have survived from a period earlier than the introduction of Christianity in the empire.

[RS]